

REMARKS

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1-12 and 15-32 are pending in this application.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the features of claim 11, as a result of which claim 11 is cancelled. Claim 18 is amended to incorporate the features of claim 29, as a result of which claim 29 is cancelled.

Claims 1 and 18 are also amended to recite that the organic polymer is an acrylic resin or a polycarbonate resin. Support for these amendments can be found on page 38, lines 31-33 of the originally filed specification..

Claims 1 and 18 are also amended to make minor editorial changes that are self-explanatory.

I. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1-12 and 15-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hay (US 7,314,652) in view of Mitsunaga (JP 2001-323149) and Hiraishi (US 2003/0156238; WO 2002/0099474). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

(A) Thickness of the Light Diffusion Sheet

Claims 1 and 18 are amended to recite that the thickness of the light diffusion sheet is “0.5 to 10 mm.” The references do not teach or suggest this feature.

Mitsunaga does not teach a film thickness, because the reference is directed to a composition.

The thickness of the light diffusing film of Hay is 0.025 to 0.5 mm (see claim 6 of Hay). The thickness of the light diffusing film of Hiraishi is 3 to 300 µm (0.003 to 0.3 mm) (see paragraph [0115]). Accordingly, the films disclosed in both Hay and Hiraishi are much thinner than the light diffusion sheet recited in claims 1 and 18.

(B) A Direct Backlight

Moreover, claim 1 recites “[a] direct backlight type liquid crystal device,” and claim 18 recites “[a] light diffusion sheet which has a protective film for a direct backlight.” Specifically, the image of a **direct backlight** unit used in the 10.4-inch TFT color liquid crystal

display device module is described in Figs. 1 and 2 of the present application (see page 42, lines 26-30 of the specification.)

The Examiner asserts that Hay teaches a direct backlight type liquid crystal device comprising a backlight source 102 (see Office Action, page 2, last paragraph).

However, both Hay and Hiraishi are related to an **edge light type** liquid crystal device. In Hay, the light source 102 is located on the side of LCT 130 (see Fig. 1). Similarly, the device in Hiraishi depicts a tubular light source 24 or 34 located on the edge portion (see Figs. 4 and 5, and paragraphs [0135] and [0136]).

In addition, the light diffusion sheet recited in claims 1 and 18 has a large thickness (0.5 to 10 mm), which avoids the shape of light sources seen from the outer surface. This large thickness enables the light diffusion sheet to be applied to a direct backlight system, and improve brightness. On the other hand, the films disclosed in Hay and Hiraishi are much thinner and are applicable to an edge light system, rather than to a backlight system. If a direct backlight is applied to the diffusion films of Hay or Hiraishi, then the light source would be seen from the outer surface, and brightness would be diminished.

(C) Brightness and Yellow Index

Furthermore, an objective of the present invention is to provide a light diffusion sheet having an improved brightness used in a direct backlight system. The brightness depends on a transmitted light and yellowing of the sheet (see page 1, lines 9-12, page 2, line 17-29 and page 9, line 5 of the specification).

The brightness and yellow index (YI) of the present invention were evaluated by test pieces having a thickness of 2 mm (see pages 42-43 of the specification). The brightness and YI naturally depend on the thickness of the film. Therefore, the brightness and YI of the present invention cannot be compared with the thin films of Hay and Hiraishi. In particular, Example #1 of Hay discloses a film having a thickness of 0.005 inch (0.127 mm) (see column 12, line 33), and Example 1 of Hiraishi discloses a film having a thickness of 100 μm (0.1 mm) (see paragraph [0175]).

(D) The Protective Film

In addition, amended claims 1 and 18 recite that the protective film is an organic polymer film and “**the organic polymer is an acrylic resin or a polycarbonate resin.**” Both Hay and

Polypropylene resin is not the same as acrylic resin or polycarbonate resin. Therefore, the references do not teach or suggest the protective film of the present invention.

(E) Summary

In view of the foregoing, claims 1 and 18 would not have been rendered obvious by the references. Claims 2-10, 12, 15-17, 19-28 and 30-32 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 18, and thus also would not have been rendered obvious by the references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Isao SOGO et al.

By:

Andrew B. Freistein
Registration No. 52,917
Attorney for Applicants

WMC/ABF/rgf
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 4, 2009